

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action of 15 July 2003, applicants hereby amend their application to make clear that their device is a spring driven drug delivery device that incorporates a dial up and dial down means. The prior art does not show an automatic syringe mechanism that allows a user to adjust a set dose downward without expelling some medication. Holman et al. merely shows a spring loaded syringe that uses energy stored within in a spring to drive a set dose of medicine from the syringe. It does not disclose a device that has a mechanism for reducing a set dose without expelling some medication from the device. If a user of the Holman et al device unintentionally sets a dose that is too large, there is no way to reduce the size of the set dose without expelling medication from the device. In some cases, this is an inconvenience because the medication must be expelled somewhere and in the case of expensive medications this can be a costly mistake. The present invention solves this problem by incorporating into a spring loaded drug delivery device a mechanism for allowing a user to reduce the size of the set dose. This combination of features is not present in the prior art. In fact, Holmes et al, states clearly and unambiguously that the dose setting mechanism is rotatable in one direction only. (*See Col. 3, lines 16-20*). It absolutely does not disclose a device wherein the dose setting mechanism may be rotated in a second direction to adjust a dose downward without expelling medication. In Holmes et al., the only time the dose setting mechanism may rotate in a direction that reduces the dose is during injections. Thus, it is not possible to reduce the set dose without expelling medication.

As claims 1, and 20 are the only independent claims pending and as they are not anticipated or obvious in view of Holman et al. the remaining dependent claims should also be allowable. Put simply, if Holman's does not render claims 1 and 20 unpatentable, it cannot render the remaining dependent claims unpatentable. Accordingly, applicants need not address here the additional rejections. Applicants' are not, however, conceding that Holman et al is in any way relevant to the other pending claims.

Attorney Docket No.: 6166.200-US
Express Mail Label No: EV 246876925 US


Applicants' attorney has included a request for an interview with this response. If the Examiner should feel that this amendment and accompanying remarks do not place the case in condition for allowance, Applicants' attorney would like to meet with the Examiner and show her the actual device that is described in Holman et al, as well as other prior art pen style syringes in order to demonstrate that the features claimed herein are not shown in the prior art or obvious in view of the prior art.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this application and to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 14-1447. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns, she should feel free to contact the applicants' attorney to discuss them.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 17, 2003



Marc A. Began, Reg. No. 48,829
Novo Nordisk Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
100 College Road West
Princeton, NJ 08540
(609) 987-5800

**Use the following customer number for all correspondence
regarding this application**

23650
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE